



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

is suspicious of Maskwell because he is betraying his friend; but Maskwell makes love to her and also shows her how to prevent the marriage of the two lovers.

In the third act of the *Méchant*, Ariste warns Valère against Cléon, just as Careless warns Mellefont against Maskwell in the first act of the *Double Dealer*. Letters arrive in which Cléon accuses himself, while Maskwell accuses himself verbally to his friends in order to allay suspicion. Both scenes produce the same effect. From the end of the third act when Valère finds himself desperately in love with Chloé, the situation is the same in both plays. In the next act, Cléon continues his double dealing by defending Ariste to Gêronte. He tells Lisette of his love for Chloé, and draws an uncomplimentary picture of Florise, who overhears it while she is concealed in a cabinet. Maskwell, in the third act, says he is tired of Lady Touchwood; and Lord Touchwood informs his wife of this fact, being unaware of the true state of his wife's feelings. His eyes are opened to the real situation by the same dramatic trick of an overheard conversation. In the last act of the *Méchant*, the eyes of Florise are opened; but Gêronte will believe nothing in favor of Valère or against Cléon, with whom he now has an understanding, until the French Double Dealer is unmasked. Lord Touchwood, in the same way, will believe nothing good of Mellefont and considers Maskwell his friend until the English Double Dealer is discredited. The two plays have entirely the same outcome.

The English comedy contains many scenes which do not advance the action, but which are merely introduced, according to Congreve's method, for the sake of humor. These scenes naturally do not occur in the French play, which observes the unity of action. The scene in the bed-room, which forms the climax of the *Double Dealer*, is also impossible on the French stage of the period. But the principal characters, the motives actuating them, the main plot, the cool double dealing of the two so-called villains are so strikingly similar that we must conclude that Gresset was consciously influenced

by Congreve to a very great extent. Surely the *Méchant* is the *Double Dealer* in French surroundings.

DONALD CLIVE STUART.

Princeton University.

### THE DATE OF THE *ENVOY TO BUKTON*

The *Envoy to Bukton* is commonly dated about the end of the year 1396, on the assumption that the closing lines of the fourth stanza—

Experience shal thee teche, so may happe,  
That thee were lever to be take in Fryse  
Than eft to falle of wedding in the trappe—

refer to the expedition of William of Hainault, described by Froissart in the fourth book of the *Chronicles*.<sup>1</sup> So conclusive has this supposed evidence been regarded, that Professor Tatlock, in the latest discussion of the chronological relations of the poem, not only remarks that "the date of *Bukton* may be fixed with great exactness and certainty," but also declares that the date assigned by Professor Skeat "is absolutely and exactly established."<sup>2</sup> I do not wish categorically to assert that the date of *Bukton* is *not* the close of 1396; but I do desire to point out that considerable caution should still be exercised in drawing exact chronological conclusions from the reference to being "take in Fryse."

Professor Kittredge has already made it quite clear<sup>3</sup> that the *Envoy* as a whole must be interpreted in the light of certain literary conventions and may not be taken too seriously as a chapter in Chaucer's autobiography. To the illustrations which he has drawn from

<sup>1</sup> See Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, I, 85, 558-59; Tatlock, *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works* (Chaucer Soc., 1907), p. 211.

<sup>2</sup> *Development and Chronology*, p. 211.

<sup>3</sup> *Modern Language Notes*, xxiv, No. 1 (Jan., 1909), pp. 14-15.

Deschamps still others might be added;<sup>4</sup> and there can be little doubt of the essentially conventional nature of the poem. Moreover, the stock character of the analogy between marriage and bondage in an enemy's country is obvious enough. The passage cited by Professor Kittredge<sup>5</sup> from Deschamps's *balade* No. 977<sup>6</sup> is a clear case in point:

J'ay demouré entre les Sarrasins,  
Esclave esté en pays de Surie.

Indeed this whole *balade* is uncommonly pertinent—even to its use of the figure of the trap:

Prince, homme n'est, ne si foul ne si saige,  
Se femme prant, qu'elle ne l'assouaige,  
Et qui ne soit par son fait entrapé.<sup>7</sup>

Yet, granting all this, Chaucer's reference to Fryse seems to be still so explicit as to warrant

<sup>4</sup> See especially the poetical epistle (*Oeuvres complètes de Eustache Deschamps*, VIII, 37-44) written (or purporting to be written) by two members of Deschamps's circle, Regnault d'Angennes (l. 75) and Robinet le Tirant (l. 77), and addressed to Messire Guillaume de Meleun on his wedding day (December 20, 1390). Chaucer's hesitancy in referring to marriage as "the cheyne of Sathanas" is not shared by Robinet:

J'enten par mariage enfer,  
Quant au corps, car homme de fer  
Y est ars, rostiz et brulez  
Et par male femme crulez,  
Comme paille mis au neant (ll. 103-107).

The "ful hard is to be bonde" is there too:

Et je vous moustreray comment  
Vous estes sers dolentement  
A femme, quant vous lui jurez  
Que jamais ne la changerez  
Ne pour pieur ne pour milleur.  
Helas! vez ci dure douleur,  
Et qui pis est, tele espousaille  
Est un droit gage de bataille  
Dont l'un des deux couvient mourir  
Ains qu'om s'en puisse departir (ll. 123-132).

The list of "sorwes and woes," however, is too long to be given in full. For example:

S'il veult du dur, il a du moul;  
S'il veult des pois, il a du choul (ll. 153-54).  
S'il parle bas, sa femme huye;  
S'il rit, lors sa femme plourra (ll. 190-91)—and so on.

<sup>5</sup> In the article referred to, p. 15, col. 1, near foot.

<sup>6</sup> Vol. v, 217.

<sup>7</sup> Ll. 31-33.

the conclusion that he is giving to a familiar commonplace a fresh turn, on the suggestion of a particular historical event.

But what if the reference to Fryse be itself a commonplace? There are two passages—one quite recently made accessible, the other long in print—which indicate that Friesland and the Frieslanders enjoyed in fourteenth century literature a certain proverbial notoriety. In Froissart's *La Prison Amoureuse* occur the following lines:

. . . les ors villains de Frise,  
Es quels n'a point de gentillece,  
D'onneur, de bien, ne de noblece,  
Et vivent ensi comme bestes.  
Tant ont lourdes et sotes testes!<sup>8</sup>

Even more striking is a passage from Machaut, in which a return from Friesland and its "ors villains" is described in no uncertain terms:

Douceur, charité ne confort  
Ne truis en homme de l'eglise;  
N'i a celui qui me confort,  
Ne[s] que se j'estoie de Frise  
Venus tous nus en ma chemise,  
Querans mon pain de jour en jour.<sup>9</sup>

What could more aptly describe (one might ask) the condition in which (on the current assumption) one of William of Hainault's men might be supposed to have returned from the expedition of 1396? Yet Machaut was dead nearly twenty years before that expedition took place, and Froissart's lines antedated it by just a quarter of a century. Since, then, the characteristics of the Frisians implied in the phrase of the *Envoy* had been the subject of remark in verse almost from the time when Chaucer himself began to write, it is scarcely safe to assert that the lines in the *Envoy* contain a necessary reference to the particular events of 1396.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Ll. 825-29, Froissart, *Oeuvres*, ed. Scheler, I, 239. The date of *La Prison Amoureuse* is 1371. See ll. 2252-53 (I, 288).

<sup>9</sup> Machaut, *Poésies lyriques*, ed. Chichmaref, I, 234 (ccxi).

<sup>10</sup> Watriquet de Couvin's "une oe de Frise" (*Oeuvres*, p. 308, *Faustrie*, l. 382) looks like something of the same sort as is indicated in the other passages. There

But after giving this necessary caution its due weight, it still seems probable that the line *was* suggested by the expedition of William of Hainault. Only, instead of declaring with Professor Tatlock that "the poem cannot have been written before October, 1396,"<sup>11</sup> I should put it precisely the other way, and say that the poem very probably *was* written before October, 1396. In other words, it was the *preparations* for the expedition which gave the allusion pertinence, whereas the *outcome* of the expedition, in point of fact, left it with little relevance. A brief consideration of the facts, I think, will make this clear.

In 1395 Henry of Hungary sent to the King of France an embassy, informing him of the threat of the Great Turk to invade Henry's realm, as well as of his boast that he would go to Rome and make his horse eat oats on the high altar of St. Peter's. The embassy was commissioned to secure the aid of France.<sup>12</sup> As a result, John of Burgoyne was placed at the head of a body of a thousand knights and squires, which was to come to the aid of Hungary—and later (as we know) to meet disaster at Nicopolis.

Now it happened that John of Burgoyne was married to the daughter of Duke Albert of Bavaria, Earl of Hainault, Holland and Zealand,<sup>13</sup> and that news of the expedition came to William of Hainault, Albert's son. William thereupon urged his father to let him join his brother-in-law's forces. Albert, however, had his own plans, which included the conquest of

Friesland, and William's warlike energy was skillfully diverted from Hungary and the Turk to his own stubborn inheritance in the North. But such an expedition likewise demanded aid. Accordingly, ambassadors were sent to England to get men of arms and archers, and especially to induce the Earl of Derby to join his cousin's forces.<sup>14</sup> John of Gaunt, however, declined to give his consent, and the Earl of Derby remained at home. The king, on the other hand, gathered together in the Thames a number of vessels for William's aid, to sail to Enkhuysen in Holland. It is therefore clear that the contemplated expedition into Friesland was well known in England for months before the actual start was made.

But we can go farther still. For from the reasons urged by the Duke of Guelderland to John of Gaunt against the Earl of Derby's participation in the expedition it is easy to see how the enterprise was regarded: "He [the Duke of Guelderland] aunswered and sayd, that it was a parylous voyage, and that Frese was a countrey nat lyghtly to be wonne; sayenge, howe in tymes past there had been dyvers erles of Holande and Heynalte that have claymed their right there, and gone thyder to have put them in subjectyon, but they have always loste their lyves there, *affyrmyng* howe the *Fresons* are people without honour, and have no mercy; they prayse nor love no lorde in the worlde, they be so proude; and also their country is stronge," etc.<sup>15</sup> Even that, however, is not all. For Froissart rehearses with the utmost explicitness the general apprehension which the expedition aroused: "Nowe whyle this assemble was thus made in Haynalte, it were to be demaunded if the ladyes and gentlewomen and other were joyouse of this journey. We oughte to say naye, for than they sawe their fathers, their bretherne, their uncles, their husbandes, and their lovers and frendes departe to that peryllous warre: *for some of them knewe well howe that in tyme paste the Haynowayes wente with their lorde into Frese, and never retourned agayne*; wherfore they feared leste it shulde

seems, moreover, to be some indication that Frise was regarded as more or less of a jumping-off place:

Si n'ot plus bele *jusqu'en Frise*

Fors la bele Leryopé

(Robert of Blois, ed. Ulrich, II, 18);

N'est pas dous tex maus

*Jusqu'en Frise*

N'a si fort justice

(Gillebert de Bernville, in Dinaux, *Trouvères*, II, 194).

<sup>11</sup> P. 211. Skeat says (*Oxford Chaucer*, I, 85) "during or just after the expedition."

<sup>12</sup> Froissart, *Chronicles*, Vol. II, chap. cciii. I am using Lord Berners's translation (in the *Tudor Translations*), as I have not at present access to the original.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> Chap. ccix.

<sup>15</sup> Chap. ccix.

hap so than to these as it dyd on their predecessours." <sup>16</sup> That is to say, it was the fate of earlier expeditions which disturbed, at this particular juncture of affairs, the minds of those who were interested in *this* expedition, and an allusion to being "take in Fryse," which might have been made at any time during the previous decade or so, would undoubtedly have peculiar pertinence at just this time.

But it would *not* have had the same pertinence, if indeed it would have had any, after the expedition itself. For by William of Hainault's campaign the old order was decidedly reversed. Even the Frieslanders themselves had understood the situation better. Juye Jouer, their leader, called by some "the great Fresone" from his enormous height, began his address to his men as follows: "O, ye noble and free Fresons, knowe for trouthe there is no chaunce but may tourne. Though by your valyantesse ye have or this tyme disconfyted the Henowayes, the Hallanders, and the Zelanders, knowe for trouthe, that suche as come nowe upon you, are people more experte in the warre thanne they were before, and beleve verily, they shall do otherwise than their predecessours dyde; they wyll not gyve it up, they wyll menteyne their dedes." <sup>17</sup> And his forebodings were justified by the event. It was precisely William of Hainault's expedition which went far to lay the fear of being "take in Fryse" which had haunted during the previous decades the minds of all who had to do with Friesland. And Chaucer's line, pertinent at any time during these previous decades, but peculiarly relevant during the year preceding August, 1396, would have had little or no point at any time *after* the expedition.

Finally, the one *certainty* in the case is the fact that the *Envoy* followed the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*. <sup>18</sup> If the *Wife of Bath's Prologue* was written during 1393 or early in 1394, as I have recently shown reason to believe, <sup>19</sup> then the

*Envoy* must be dated after the middle or end of 1393. If further the Robert Bukton whose wife is mentioned in a grant of March 14, 1397 <sup>20</sup> is the Bukton of the *Envoy*, then the *Envoy* belongs somewhere between the middle of 1393 and the beginning of 1397. If the facts which I have just pointed out have any weight, the line about the danger of being "take in Fryse" might have been written at any time within these limits. It is quite possible, I should say even probable, that it was the expedition of August and September, 1396, which suggested the allusion. But in that case it was the state of mind which accompanied the *preparations* for the expedition, rather than the outcome of the campaign itself, which gave the allusion point. Even on the orthodox assumption, then, the poem should be placed *before* rather than *after* August, 1396.

JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES.

Washington University.

---

#### THE USE OF THE FRENCH PAST DEFINITE IN *SI*-CLAUSES

The use of the French past definite in *si*-clauses seems scarcely touched upon in treatises on French Grammar. In looking through more than forty such works in English, French and German, including Brunot, Darmesteter, Meyer-Lübke, Tobler and many others, I have found only four references to the subject. E. Etienne, in his *Essai de grammaire de l'ancien français*, p. 298, among a list of conditions in which "la chose est considérée comme non douteuse," gives one example of the p. def. Professor E. C. Armstrong, *Syntax of the French Verb*, under the heading: "*Si* clauses equivalent to declarative statements," says: "In them, the verb may be in the past definite, the future, the conditional, or their compounds." <sup>1</sup> None of them can be

<sup>16</sup> Chap. cexi.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> The Wyf of Bathe I pray you that ye rede

Of this matere that we have on honde (ll. 29-30).

<sup>19</sup> *Modern Philology*, viii, 327 ff.

<sup>20</sup> See Tatlock, 211, n. Professor Tatlock's identification, however, does not seem to me to be convincing.

<sup>1</sup> I have not noted any instances of the past anterior.